

CONFIDENTIAL

173-4458

XK 73-3862

2 JUL 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Colby

Bill:

I know that Carl, Ed and Hal have given you their candid criticism of the IC proposal for USIB committees. Based on my conversations with them, I feel certain I would agree with everything they told you and perhaps they covered it all. However, it is an important problem and I cannot be content without making a few comments to you directly and offering my help in whatever next step is necessary.

I think the USIB Committee structure does need revision and you should use the leverage of your new appointment to make some well considered changes. ✓

What should these changes be? The answer still needs to be developed and any study that seeks a constructive proposal should start with the following assumptions:


1. The USIB Committee structure is "community property" and if it is to be useful, your constituency must be comfortable with it. The people of the community must therefore feel they have participated in the development of changes and any study group commissioned to propose a reorganization must spend a lot of time with the USIB Principals and with the collection and production elements -- initially letting their ideas about what's wrong and then getting their comments on the changes that might be made. Yes ✓

2. The wisdom of the past should not be discarded lightly. There are reasons why the committee structure has evolved into its present form and some of these are probably still valid. We should be willing to preserve what has proven effective and be sure we understand why certain parts of the structure have been ineffective before discarding or changing them. Yes ✓

3. On the other hand, we should recognize that a number of years have passed since the committees were organized and some significant changes in the world have occurred. Among them:

- Economic issues have become more prominent.
Does the current USIB structure adequately serve this new importance?

CONFIDENTIAL



25X1

- Satellites, telemetry and ELINT have become much more important than they were when the SIGINT Committee was established many years ago to coordinate COMINT activities. Should the SIGINT Committee be split into a COMINT Committee and an ELINT/Telemetry Committee? Or into three committees? Should they have a larger staff like COMIREX, which all agree has been effective in its world of photography? What about IR, laser, reentry area collection, requirements and tasking? How should we support these committees with a "collection strategy"?

- Military intelligence now relies more heavily on technical intelligence support; new military technologies have sprung to the fore; new military operations such as ASW have risen to national importance. Does the Scientific Intelligence Committee now have too much to cover? Should it be subdivided?

- The White House has become more and more interested in the "big picture" and in regional and total force effectiveness. Should we have "regional" committees? Or "country" committees? Should we have a "military forces" committee?


- The DCI has acquired new responsibilities for community resource management. Should the committees be structured to better support IRAC as well as USIB? There have been examples of very effective action by GMAIC and JAEIC in this regard when they were specifically charged with a well defined task. Why were these committees able to make hard recommendations about collection resources when COMIREX and the SIGINT Committees have been generally ineffective in this area?

- You have indicated a desire to establish "special assistants" to be your community experts and spokesmen in areas of importance. Should the USIB committees be structured to support these people? Should these people chair some of the committees?

I think there are some important questions to be answered and changes to be made. The IC Staff Study has dealt with very few of them and I believe its sponsors have now carried it too far as a concrete proposal to be able to change their ideas or to be accepted by the community as open-minded investigators. To make progress from this point, I think it will be necessary for you to commission a new task force of carefully selected

CONFIDENTIAL

people to develop additional alternatives and recommendations. It should report directly to you; its appointment should be well publicized within the community and it should be given a leisurely schedule to enable it to establish the necessary contacts and rapport with community elements. If you decide to do this, I would be pleased to be a part of it.



Donald H. Steininger

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL